

PART C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

C.1 INTRODUCTION

C.1.1 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Part C of this document examines the environmental consequences associated with the Proposed Project and the alternatives to the Proposed Project. Analysis within each issue area includes consideration of the following project components:

- Construction of the proposed pipeline between Carson and Norwalk (13 miles)
- Modifications to the Carson, Norwalk, Industry, and Colton Stations
- Operation of the proposed project, including normal operation and accidents/upset conditions
- Secondary impacts of project operation.

Part B offers a complete and detailed description of the Proposed Project and the alternative route segments. In Part C, the Proposed Project and each of the alternative routes are analyzed in full detail.

C.1.2 CONTENTS OF PART C

Part C includes analyses of the 12 environmental issue areas listed below:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| C.2 Air Quality | C.9 Noise |
| C.3 Biological Resources | C.10 Socioeconomics, Public Services
and Utilities |
| C.4 Cultural Resources | C.11 System Safety and Risk of Upset |
| C.5 Environmental Contamination | C.12 Transportation and Traffic |
| C.6 Geology and Soils | C.13 Visual Resources |
| C.7 Hydrology | |
| C.8 Land Use and Public Recreation | |

Within each issue area, the Proposed Project and alternative projects are discussed in the following order:

- Environmental Baseline and Regulatory Setting for the Proposed Project
- Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project
- Santa Fe Alternative Segment
- Cherry Alternative Segment
- Paramount Alternative Segment
- Alondra Alternative Segment
- Bellflower Rail Alternative Segment
- Artesia Alternative Segment
- Shoemaker Alternative Segment
- No Project Alternative
- Mitigation Monitoring Program
- References.

By identifying the impacts associated with each issue area and the offsetting mitigation measures, the regulatory agencies and the general public are offered a discussion and full disclosure of the significant environmental impacts of this Proposed Project and its alternatives.

C.1.3 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

C.1.3.1 Environmental Baseline

In Part C, the analysis within each issue area begins with an examination of the existing physical or baseline setting wherein the Proposed Project would be placed. The regulatory setting, which includes applicable government rules, regulations, plans, and policies, is also presented in the baseline setting. For the purpose of this document, and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, the baseline used for the impact analysis reflects the actual conditions at the time of preparation of the report.

C.1.3.2 Environmental Consequences

The environmental consequences and potential impacts that the Proposed Project would bring to each issue area are quantified. Mitigation measures for each impact are identified, where feasible, and the residual impact is assessed. The analysis of impacts on the environment and specific resources is based on the Project Description as presented in Part B of this document.

Significance Criteria. The impacts identified by applying the assessment methodology were then compared with predetermined, specific significance criteria, and were classified according to significance categories listed in each issue area (see Section C.1.4 for discussion of significance criteria). The cumulative impacts of the project taken together with the related cumulative projects (listed in Section B.10) were assessed next, and mitigation measures for each impact were identified. The focus in the cumulative impact analyses was to identify those project impacts that might not be significant when considered alone, but contribute to a significant impact when viewed in conjunction with future planned projects. Finally, the impacts found to be significant and unavoidable or unmitigable to a non-significant level were identified. The same methodology was applied systematically to each alternative project and alternative route alignment. A comparative analysis of the Proposed Project and the alternatives is provided in Part D of this document.

Applicant Proposed Measures. The Applicant has incorporated a significant number of measures and procedures into the description of the Proposed Project that would avoid or reduce impacts. In the assessment of the impacts, these measures have been assumed to be part of the Proposed Project, and are not included as mitigation measures or in the Mitigation Monitoring Programs. The Applicant Proposed Measures that could reduce the potential impacts in an issue area (such as air quality, system safety, etc.) are summarized in that particular issue area.

Mitigation Measures. Once an impact was identified, diligent effort was taken to identify mitigation measures that will reduce the impact to a level that is not significant. Since some reviewing agencies require a

demonstration of reduction of impacts to the maximum extent possible, mitigation measures were identified for all classes of impacts (except beneficial impacts). The mitigation measures recommended by this study have been identified in the impact assessment sections and presented in a Mitigation Monitoring Program at the end of the analysis for each issue area (see also Part F for discussion of the Mitigation Monitoring Program).

There are impacts that cannot be fully mitigated to non-significant levels. These impacts are referred to as unavoidable significant impacts, and summarized at the end of each issue area analysis.

Secondary (Indirect) Impacts. Section B.3.3 describes the disposition of the additional refined products that will arrive at the Colton Terminal as a result of the implementation of this project. As required by CEQA and by CPUC guidelines, the secondary impacts of the proposed project are also evaluated within each issue area. Therefore, the impacts of additional pipeline throughput in the CalNev and Phoenix-West pipelines are evaluated, as well as the impacts of additional trucking in the Inland Empire and southern California area.

Pipeline Abandonment. Section B.6 describes SFPP's plans for pipeline abandonment, after the estimated 50-year life of the pipeline. Since the pipeline is proposed to be cleaned, filled with inert gas, and abandoned in place, no impacts are expected to result from abandonment. Therefore, this issue is not evaluated in each issue area.

C.1.4 SIGNIFICANCE CATEGORIES

While the criteria for determining significant impacts are unique to each issue area, the classification of the impacts was uniformly applied in accordance with the following definitions:

- Class I:** Significant; cannot be mitigated to a level that is not significant
- Class II:** Significant; can be mitigated to a level that is not significant
- Class III:** Adverse, but not significant
- Class IV:** Beneficial impacts.